

**REMARKS**

The applicant respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks. Support for newly added claims 21 can be found in the claims 1 and 16. Support for newly added claim 22 can be found in claim 17. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 13-14, and 19-20 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfleger (US 5,792,532) (“Pfleger”). Claims 1-7, 10, 13-14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ziegler et al., WO 00/20204 (“Ziegler”). Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfleger in view of Tanaka et al., US 4,376,856 (“Tanaka”). Claims 8-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler in view of Tanaka. Claims 1-14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 13-14, and 19-20 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfleger. Claims 1-7, 10, 13-14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ziegler. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfleger in view of Tanaka. Claims 8-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler in view of Tanaka.

The applicant does not believe that Pfleger, Tanaka or Ziegler disclose the features of independent claim 21. The applicant believes that the following feature of claim 21 helps improve the adhesion between POM and TPA-E:

“which prior to the molding-on of the thermoplastic polyamide elastomer, is preheated to a temperature in the range from 80°C to just below its melting point, and the melt temperature of the thermoplastic polyamide elastomer during the process of molding onto the polyacetal molding is from 200 to 320°C”

For the above reasons, these rejections should be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 1-14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner believes that the terms “adhesively” and “cohesively” have the same meaning. The Examiner has questioned the term “modifier” in claim 5. The applicant believes that these terms have a well recognized meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art. The preferred modifiers are cited in the published specification in paragraph no. 0065 of the published specification, and claim 6. The applicant believes that the claims as amended are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. For the above reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

A three month extension fee has been paid. Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 05587-00408 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Ashley I. Pezzner/  
Ashley I. Pezzner  
Registration No.: 35,646  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1007 North Orange Street  
P. O. Box 2207  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207  
(302) 658-9141  
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant